

'Tis ignorance that tempts men
Who cannot foresee our fate,
Since Statesmen have become Politicians,
And Party is placed before State.

Some criticize the Supreme Court,
And believe them to be out of line
For they think the Court's decisions
Often make it easier for crime.

When the criminal cannot be confined
Within the so-called "Pen,"
But soon gets back to his old "gang"
To do the same—or worse—again.

Now if occasion should arise
To appoint another man,
Please find one who is just and faithful
To do the best—under God—that he can.

To wipe out crime is a fine thing,
And this is no time to laugh;
But 'twould take half of our citizens
To police the other half.

To clean this all up is much needed,
For it certainly has a big start;
And like the nice red apple
There's a worm in its very heart.

There's a Communist infiltration
And enemies, galore,
Jealous of American prosperity,
And anxious to take us o'er.

But this same infiltration
Has been apparent so long,
One can scarcely trust his neighbor,
As together we travel along.

The "Commies" threaten to "bury us"
With no apology,
But we know they would rather have us
Accept their ideology.

They've taken Cuba under their wing—
Only 90 miles away,
And we cannot trust Castro
Today nor any day.

Let us keep up a watchful waiting
On things as they are down there,
As they receive their help from overseas
We should drop to our knees in prayer.

We live in the "post Christian era,"
Is what the newspapers say;
We would do well to confess our guilt
And start over again, today.

For world conditions now
Are causing much concern,
And the best of men are puzzled
With causes they cannot discern.

Not long ago, a preacher friend,
Honest and staunch and true,
Was speaking on world conditions
And what they may lead into;
He said we must turn to God for strength—
Then, working together, must try
To help to find the way through
And not "watch a nation die."

Now when Congress makes the new laws—
The cure for all our ills—
There will be nothing left for the taxpayer
But hard work to pay the bills.

Then we'll never more so proudly
"The Star-Spangled Banner" wave—
For Americans will not be "free" men,
Nor live "in the home of the brave."

OBSERVATIONS ON SOUTH VIETNAM

Mr. ERVIN. Mr. President, I receive many communications from people who assert that the United States ought not to have become involved in the fighting in South Vietnam, and that it ought to withdraw its military forces forthwith from that unhappy land.

Ever since I came to the Senate, I have opposed the policies of the National Gov-

ernment which are based on the proposition that the United States should shoulder all the burdens of the earth. For this reason, and also because of the logistic problems which its terrain and undeveloped state create, I have never favored the stationing of our military forces in South Vietnam.

We cannot solve the South Vietnam problem, however, by asserting that we should not have stationed our military forces there or become involved in the fight of its Government and a substantial segment of its people against the Vietcong, even though it pleases some commentators to call that fight a civil war rather than a war for independence.

Ostriches may bury their heads in the sand when danger appears. But we must live as men, and not as ostriches.

Consequently, we must face stern realities in attempting to reach a conclusion concerning South Vietnam and our connection with it. These stern realities are as follows:

First. Communism has not yet forsaken its purpose of world subjugation. Proof of this statement is found in the fact that both Russia and China are furnishing weapons to the Vietcong.

Second. North Vietnam, a Communist controlled country, is using its weapons to arm the Vietcong forces, which are composed in substantial part of trained men from North Vietnam and are directed by officers placed in their command by North Vietnam.

Third. The question of whether or not the United States should be engaged in war in South Vietnam is an academic one. As Grover Cleveland would say, we are confronted by a condition and not a theory. We are already engaged in such war and our servicemen are being killed and wounded daily.

Fourth. There are only three courses of action open to the United States. The first is to settle the war by negotiation; the second is to fight the war with a will to win it; and the third is to withdraw our forces from South Vietnam and thus surrender southeast Asia to the Vietcong who are simply Communist agents.

The President has attempted to reach a settlement by negotiation. Despite the entreaties of virtually the entire civilized world, the only nations which can negotiate a settlement; that is, North Vietnam and China, have contemptuously rejected the President's offer to negotiate.

This being true, the hope that the war might be settled by negotiation seems to have degenerated for the time being into an empty dream.

As a consequence, it is obvious that the United States must either fight or withdraw. Neither our love of peace nor intellectual sophistry can disguise the truth that our withdrawal would constitute a surrender to the Communists, who are bent on extinguishing the lights of liberty throughout the earth.

Even though the executive department of the Federal Government may have erred in stationing our military forces in South Vietnam, the United States cannot afford to withdraw them as long as the Government of South Vietnam or a substantial segment of its people wish them to remain there.

The stakes involved are too high. If we withdraw under existing circumstances, we shall lose the confidence of the free world to which we have pledged our aid against Communist aggression. Moreover, all of southeast Asia, and possibly India and Pakistan, will immediately fall under Red Chinese domination. One hesitates to think what this would portend for the freedom of Malasia, the Philippines, Australia, and New Zealand, and even for that of the United States itself.

On some occasions I receive requests from well-meaning persons that I arise upon the Senate floor and denounce our presence and conduct in South Vietnam as illegal and outrageous.

Even if I were sure that these persons had complete possession of all the truth on the subject, I would be reluctant to do this for one reason and incapable of doing it for another.

While I am always ready to participate in efforts to persuade our National Government to pursue wise policies or abandon foolish ones, I am ever reluctant to denounce my country in respect to its contests with foreign foes. This is true because I was nurtured on the brand of patriotism which prompted Senator Crittenden to make this statement while the Mexican War was raging:

I hope to find my country in the right; however, I will stand by her, right or wrong.

My incapability to stand upon the Senate floor and denounce the United States for its presence and conduct in South Vietnam arises out of this consideration: My action in so doing would lend aid and comfort to Ho Chi Minh and his Vietcong because it would tend to engender in them the belief that America's will to fight is weak and that they will be masters of South Vietnam if they prolong the war and slay more Americans.

I have seen war, and I hate war. Notwithstanding, I believe that the only course reasonably open to it under existing circumstances in South Vietnam is for the United States to fight with a will to win and to strike the enemy such blows as may be necessary to bring North Vietnam to the conference table or defeat with the least delay.

After all, war is sometimes the only road which leads to ultimate peace and safety.

ESTABLISHMENT OF 12-MILE FISH- ERY ZONE

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, the Norwegian Commercial Club of Seattle, Wash., has gone on record in support of legislation I have introduced (S. 2218) along with other Senators, to establish a 12-mile fishery zone off our coast to protect our domestic fishery resources. The text of the resolution passed by the Norwegian Commercial Club points out the threat of foreign fishing operations and provides a very thoughtful statement in support of our extended fishery jurisdiction. I ask unanimous consent that a copy of this resolution be printed in the Record.

May 3, 1966

There being no objection, the resolution was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

RESOLUTION RELATING TO THE FISHING INDUSTRY, PASSED BY THE MEMBERSHIP OF THE NORWEGIAN COMMERCIAL CLUB, SEATTLE, WASH., AT ITS REGULAR MEETING HELD ON JANUARY 27, 1966

Whereas the fishing industry of the Pacific Northwest is one of our major industries and makes a great contribution to the economic strength not only of the Pacific coast, but of the entire United States; and

Whereas the Pacific Northwest fishing industry is now threatened by a large foreign fishery operation which includes a huge fleet of foreign vessels which are fishing in the Northwest area without any regard to the accepted conservation practices that have been established by the United States and Canada; and

Whereas the huge foreign fishing operation has but one objective, that of exploiting our fisheries and cannot help but break down the conservative practices now employed by the North American fishermen, with the resulting destruction of stocks of fish upon which fishermen of the United States and Canada must depend for future employment in the Pacific Northwest fishing industry; and

Whereas the conditions now existing with the invasion of the foreign fishing fleets in the Pacific Northwest have not been given adequate consideration by the various departments of the U.S. Government looking toward the protection of the fishermen of the Pacific Northwest fishing industry; and

Whereas one of the principal means of giving some measure of protection to the Pacific Northwest fishing industry is by the extension of the U.S. territorial limits from the 3-mile limit to a 12-mile limit: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the Norwegian Commercial Club of Seattle, Wash., through this resolution, urges and requests the U.S. Government and its various agencies to extend immediately the limit of U.S. fisheries jurisdiction from 3 miles to 12 miles with the establishment of appropriate baselines from which these limits are determined, and after this is done, that the U.S. Government agencies be requested to seek further international agreements either to allow sufficient extension beyond the 12-mile limit, or other appropriate measures to adequately protect the stocks of fish which owe their existence solely to the conservation efforts and programs established by the North American fishermen; and to protect from depletion other stocks of fish existing in the Pacific Ocean and Alaskan waters, the exploitation of which stocks by foreign vessels is of relative recent origin and upon which stocks the fishermen of the Pacific Northwest will depend in the future for their livelihood and to which our country will look for part of its food supply in the future; and be it further

Resolved, That copies of this resolution be sent to the President of the United States; the Members of the U.S. Senate and the U.S. Congress from the State of Washington; the Governor of the State of Washington; and the various Government agencies dealing with the fishing industry.

WHAT IT TAKES TO WIN IN VIETNAM

Mr. FANNIN. Mr. President, some Americans undoubtedly are confused by the number of contradictory statements and articles about the war in Vietnam. One of those who is not confused is the editor of the Arizona Daily Star in Tucson, Mr. William R. Mathews. On April 24, he published an editorial entitled

"What It Takes To Win in Vietnam" which I commend to all Members of the Senate and ask unanimous consent for it to be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

WHAT IT TAKES TO WIN IN VIETNAM

(By William R. Mathews)

If there were anything easy to predict, it would be to forecast that the troubled domestic political situation in Vietnam amounts to a continuation of what has gone on in the past, and will continue in the future. There will be elections within 5 months, probably. Once the tallies are made public, there will be losers and victors. The losers will cry about fraud.

If a civilian government is established, the chances are that it will last not many months, and possibly only weeks. Another civilian government will succeed it, and it will go through much the same process. Finally another dictatorship, probably a military one, will take over. It, too, will last only some months, unless Washington gets tough with the religious and political leaders of the country, which will include some generals.

There are some good reasons to justify this forecast. One of the most powerful is war weariness, which generates religious and patriotic passions, and divides a country into warring political fragments. Because South Vietnam is a country of fragmented political parties, civilian life will continue in a state of anarchy and thus weaken the military effort.

Amid all of this development, America will continue to wage war against the Vietcong as best it can. The South Vietnam Army obviously will be weakened, and will be unable to carry its share of the war load. Our bombing will continue and will have to be enlarged against basic targets, like oil storage farms in North Vietnam. It should be realized that North Vietnam has trucks, and that they run supplies and men south, using gasoline or diesel fuel which we permit North Vietnam to import, store, and use. If we finally hit those oil installations, the trucks would lack fuel. The supply line would be weakened at the source of its strength.

Thus the situation we American find ourselves in will continue probably for years—certainly until we get tired of it, or get tough with the leaders of the numerous religious and political factions. If enough of them do not agree to unify and create a war government with militant leadership, that will not tolerate any organized opposition during the period of the war, we should pull out. Unite and fight must be our policy, and we should mean it and not apologize for it. Our patience is no longer a virtue, because it is taken as a sign of weakness.

That is obviously has encouraged the leaders of North Vietnam is proven by their scorn of our failure to develop a unified war effort in South Vietnam. Until we do that, and add to it the extension of our bombing against military targets in all of North Vietnam, the leaders of North Vietnam will remain firm in their unwillingness to talk.

We have to break the will of their political and military leaders to resist. No war is won or even stalemated, until the will of such leaders is impaired or broken. Our Civil War was not won until the will of Gen. Robert E. Lee was broken. World War I was not won until the will of Von Hindenburg was broken sufficiently to have him demand that his Kaiser abdicate.

In World War II, the Germans were denied victory in their invasion of the Soviet Union by the will of Stalin to unite the efforts of his people in "the great patriotic war." The

war was not won until the will of Hitler was broken by his own suicide.

The Korean war was not won by us because we did not have the will to win it. The persistence of the Chinese, led by Mao, endured long enough to win a compromise from us.

The war in Vietnam will not be won until we and South Vietnam unite with the determination to win it. For us to imagine that North Vietnam will talk to us as long as anarchy prevails in South Vietnam, and our political leaders openly proclaim our reasonableness, is wishful thinking.

The leaders of North Vietnam will not talk reasonably until the political government of South Vietnam unites with our Army, Air Force, and Navy to wage war with a unity that can win and can hurt North Vietnam.

Consequently, if we are going to pet and pamper the political leaders of South Vietnam, and meticulously stand aside and thereby encourage anarchy and disunity, we will be stuck in Vietnam with an ever-increasing cost in American lives and wealth. That could become a devastating political issue by 1968 at least, and possibly in 1966.

Our intensified bombing of North Vietnam could be decisive if it were backed by a unified and competent government of South Vietnam, whose armies would unite with ours in sea, land, and air operations that would drive the invaders from the country. The Vietcong will not give up, until they see that they are licked, and neither will North Vietnam.

Speeches by Ambassador Goldberg, Senator Mansfield and Secretary Rusk during the past week have been most unfortunate. These expressions of reasonableness will cause the Vietcong and the political leaders of Hanoi to be more adamant than ever. They see them as proof of our political weakness and our lack of will to wage war.

In such circumstances, the conclusion in Vietnam will continue; our soldiers out there will be more confused; so will many Senators and Congressmen. This confusion will grow among the people of the United States.

No wonder the Chinese people speak of us as a paper tiger.

THE THIRD HOUSE

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Mr. President, complaints against the Rules Committee of the House of Representatives have been long, loud, and legion, but not always legitimate. Although it has proved at times to be a formidable roadblock for good legislation—depending, of course, upon one's own viewpoint, just as "beauty is altogether in the eye of the beholder"—the committee has also been known to provide decent but timely burial for legislative measures the passage of which would have been not only embarrassing to the authors thereof but also inimical to the welfare of the country. Thus, the committee has been, at one and the same time, a good scapegoat and a scapegoat good for responsible government.

For, what may appear as the devil's handmaiden to the political scientist in the ivory tower of the college classroom may in reality be a blessing in disguise to the scientific politician in the very real arena of the legislative process.

The House Rules Committee, like the traffic policeman on the street, often finds itself the target of vituperation from those whom it serves.

It cannot be gainsaid that the committee has been authoritarian, despotic,

May 3, 1966

wasn't being born. Shortly after one of his radio broadcasts he went to the prosecutor with what was almost an accusation, and there was nothing for the prosecutor to do but send the detectives over to the clinic to see what was going on."

In the course of appealing the case from the lower courts, where he and Mrs. Griswold were fined \$100 each and released on \$250 bond, Dr. Buxton wrote to experts at every medical college in the country, asking for written support. He got it, even from many Catholic medical schools. Finally, on June 7, 1965, the U.S. Supreme Court handed down its historic 7-to-2 decision. Justice William O. Douglas, in writing the majority opinion, declared the case concerned "a relationship lying within the zone of privacy created by several fundamental constitutional guarantees" and said the Connecticut law "in forbidding the use of contraceptives rather than regulating their manufacture or sale, seeks to achieve its goals by means having a maximum destructive impact upon that relationship."

"We deal with a right of privacy older than the Bill of Rights—older than our political parties, older than our school system," he concluded. "Marriage is a coming together for better or worse, hopefully enduring and intimate to the degree of being sacred."

The two dissenting Justices, Stewart and Black, both thought the Connecticut law offensive but constitutional.

Within days after the Supreme Court decision the New York Legislature modified its 84-year-old Comstock law to remove all restrictions on the dissemination of birth-control information and to permit sale of contraceptives to everyone over the age of 16. Although the law had not been enforced for years, it had been resurrected by the Catholic Welfare Conference in an effort to stop birth-control activities by the State board of social welfare.

Later in the summer the Massachusetts Legislature defeated a similar repeal move, but this was the one exception to last year's general easing of legal and administrative restraints. Ohio and Minnesota joined New York in clearing away restrictions from their statutes. Seven States—California, Colorado, Illinois, Iowa, Kansas, Michigan, and Nevada—adopted positive legislation to authorize or encourage public family planning services. And according to a Planned Parenthood survey more than 40 States have made administrative decisions favorable to such programs over the past 4 or 5 years.

The long and bitter political battle in Chicago and Illinois ended last June when the State legislature passed a resolution authorizing State agencies to provide birth-control services. And the Chicago Board of Health, under the adroit persuasion of its president, Dr. Eric Oldberg, a prominent neurosurgeon, cautiously began family planning services in 9 of its 39 city health centers. His viewpoint conflicts sharply with that of Dr. Karl A. Meyer, 79-year-old medical superintendent of the huge Cook County Hospital, which still has no birth-control clinics even though its annual delivery of 18,000 babies is the largest of any hospital in the country. "Birth control," Meyer has remarked, "is a socioeconomic problem, not a medical one."

However you define it, birth-control information has been denied to the many women who have sought it at Cook County. In an interview on CBS-TV, one woman said she asked a doctor at Cook County if he could help her stop having children. "He told me no, I was too young," she said, "and was good for 20 more."

"CIVIC ACTION" IN VIETNAM

Mr. TOWER. Mr. President, Reporter Bob Schieffer of the Fort Worth Star-Telegram has recently written a most

penetrating and important article about the Vietnam war. In it, he points out the fact that in this troubled land our pacification work is going ahead on a priority equal to the battle efforts. My own trips to South Vietnam confirm for me that Mr. Schieffer is correct.

I commend him on his apt analysis and congratulate the Star-Telegram for providing its readers such professional and talented observers.

In order that other Senators may share Mr. Schieffer's thoughts, I ask unanimous consent that the article be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

COCKED WEAPONS AND TIP OF HELMET: KILLING, PACIFYING GO HAND IN HAND IN VIETNAM

(EDITOR'S NOTE.—Soldiers in Vietnam often find themselves engaged in civic as well as military action, writes Bob Schieffer, who recently returned after 4 months in Vietnam. Why and how the servicemen wage a war of pacification is told in this article, the fifth of a series.)

(By Bob Schieffer)

On Monday a marine private might be pinned down by enemy rifle fire as his company advances on a Vietcong controlled village.

By Tuesday afternoon he might be helping one of the villagers to build a pigsty or showing a small boy how to put medicine on a leech bite.

"Every marine is a civic action officer," Maj. Paul Melcher, who heads the Marine civic action program, explained one day.

"You might say we go into a village with weapons cocked but we still tip our helmets."

"Civic action" or "pacification" as it is sometimes called is one of the biggest efforts in the war against the Vietcong.

In short, pacification is a program to build the loyalty, confidence and respect of the peasants in Vietnam's farflung rural hamlets for the Central Government.

There is a saying in Vietnam that "the Emperor's power does not extend beyond the palace gate."

Vietnam no longer has an Emperor, but a succession of Saigon governments has found it difficult to extend much influence beyond the streets of the capital city.

Sometimes when friendly forces drive the Vietcong out of a village they find themselves unwelcome.

"You can't blame them for being suspicious," said an Army captain. "They expect the worst because that's all they've ever had."

That is why such emphasis, government officials say, is placed on pacification.

The soldiers attempt to show the villagers that their government can offer them a better life.

Schools are rebuilt, committees are organized for food distribution and public health and other services which more sophisticated societies expect in return for their taxes.

Care is exercised and tight controls are used in the civic reforms.

"If a person needs pills to cure an illness," says Maj. Mike Styles, a marine based at Da Nang, "he is given only one pill and told to come back the next day for his next dose."

"That way the Vietcong are not liable to get hold of a large supply of medical supplies."

"Also we feel that this gives a person a chance to maintain more frequent contact with his government, especially the village chief."

The village chief is always present at such functions and American representatives are careful to see that such aid is never a project greater than what the Saigon government will be able to furnish after the Americans are gone.

Civic action can range from singing classes to rebuilding burnt-out schools.

The Korean soldiers often instituted another twist. Tra Quan Do, the Korean combination of karate and judo.

The Korean soldiers often stage shows to display their prowess in the deadly art. They will break planks over their heads and shatter bricks with their bare hands.

"We tell the villager, 'See how strong we are. You don't have to be afraid of the Vietcong anymore, we'll show you how you can be this strong too,'" said Maj. Gen. Chae Myung Shin, boss of the ROK Tiger Division.

"We have 700 high school age boys enrolled in the classes," Chae said. "We've really been encouraged."

The projects are not always encouraging. Advisers once built a small village a well only to return later and find it being used as a community latrine.

Foodstuffs are sometimes distributed and later found in Vietcong supply areas.

But the program continues and is having at least some effect.

Tien Phong, organ of the Communist Party in North Vietnam, reported the American buildup and pacification, practically speaking, had forced the Vietcong to extract higher taxes from the peasant and increase military conscription.

The Communist magazine counseled the comrades not to forget the political side of the war.

They admit they are being hurt by the pacification programs. They also admit, like politicians in other countries, that raising taxes and increasing the draft are not the easiest ways to make friends.

EIGHTEENTH ANNIVERSARY OF STATE OF ISRAEL

Mr. MONDALE. Mr. President, last week, together with a number of other Members of this body, and Members of the other House, I had the privilege of attending a luncheon sponsored by the American Israel Public Affairs Committee. It was a part of the Seventh Annual National Policy Conference of the committee, and coincided with the 18th birthday of the State of Israel.

I understand that the Hebrew word for 18 is "chai" which also means "life." A particularly significant birthday, I should think, for a state which has given dignity and opportunity to so many lives and which has in fact been responsible for saving the lives of a considerable part of its populace. To oppressed and homeless Jews throughout the world, living in lands where freedom is a myth and tolerance a vice, the word "life" and the word "Israel" can also be synonymous.

In the spirit of celebration of Israel's 18th birthday, and in recognition of the close and continuing ties of friendship between our two democracies, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD the text of the address delivered last week by Dr. Phillip S. Bernstein, chairman of the American Israel Public Affairs Committee, and the policy statement adopted by the committee at the conference.

May 3, 1966

There being no objection, the address and statement were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

TEXT OF ADDRESS BY RABBI PHILIP S. BERNSTEIN, CHAIRMAN OF THE AMERICAN ISRAEL PUBLIC AFFAIRS COMMITTEE

According to an ancient Jewish practice there are prescribed readings from the Scriptures in each Sabbath service. Last Saturday morning we read from II Kings, chapter 5. It told of Naaman, the Aramean general, who was stricken with leprosy. Learning of a healing prophet in Israel named Elisha he sought him out for advice. The prophet said, "Bathe seven times in the river Jordan." Naaman was furious. Were there not rivers in Syria larger and greater than the little Jordan? But he was persuaded and he was healed.

The Jordan is a little river. Palestine is a small country. Israel is no larger than New Jersey. But that little place has brought healing and light and hope to mankind. Out of it have come the three great religions of the Western World. From the Holy Land emerged moral guidance, the blueprint for the good life, the messianic goals of God's kingdom.

This has been understood in the Western World, and the special relationship of the Jewish people to its ancestral home has been recognized.

Especially has this been true in America. Every American President since Woodrow Wilson endorsed the Zionist objective. President Harry Truman gave official recognition to the State of Israel within minutes after its establishment. For decades now the Congress of the United States has indicated its approval and support by official action and practical aid. The American people on the whole have been sympathetic and helpful. Without this sympathy and aid Israel might not have come into existence, and it would have faced the greatest difficulty in surviving. For this Israel and its friends are profoundly grateful.

However, I want to point out on this occasion that this has been a reciprocal process. Israel has made very important contributions. It was one of the first free states to emerge after World War II. It became a pilot plant for small aspiring democracies.

Israel has given technical aid, guidance and assistance to more than 60 countries in Asia, Africa, and, more recently, in Latin America. Israel is committed to democracy by its deepest instincts and by its most urgent needs. It does not wish to be a pawn in the East-West struggle, but a whole constellation of factors have made it the one trustworthy bastion of democracy in that part of the world.

Israel is steadily becoming economically stronger. It still needs help from the West because of its heavy burdens of defense, because of the cessation of German reparations and because of its large-scale immigration.

However, it has been pointed out that U.S. commercial sales to Israel have climbed from about \$70 million in 1960 to more than \$125 million in 1964. The desalinization program for which we hope there will be adequate assistance by the United States is not entirely altruistic, but will be through Israel's technological competence of great assistance to our country as well. There is hardly an important level of life in which there cannot be a mutually fruitfying exchange of ideas and personnel.

This is Israel's 18th birthday. The Hebrew word is "chal," which means life. It is wonderful after the Nazi holocaust—and remember at just this time 23 years ago the Nazis were engaged in destroying the embattled Jews of the Warsaw ghetto—that children in Israel sing "Am Yisrael Chai," the Jewish people lives. It's wonderful that a strong viable democratic state has come into

existence which again promises a moral message to mankind.

But problems continue. The Arab States, and especially the United Arab Republic under Nasser's leadership, are committed to the destruction of Israel. Can we not express the hope that the United States will use its great influence, its strength, its firm statesmanship, toward bringing Arabs and Jews together at a peace table? The mood seems to be changing somewhat in the Arab countries. Can we not by a firm clear position throw all our weight behind efforts to achieve peace? Israel desperately wants it. The Arabs desperately need it.

However, until that consummation is reached and while the U.S.S.R. pours billions in arms into the Arab lands, our Government must help Israel to maintain deterrent strength. We know it is such strength that has kept Nasser from attacking Israel in the past and we know that it will be a deterrent factor in the future. By such aid as needed we are in effect saying to the peoples of the area that an arms race is futile, wasteful, and dangerous; that it will not bring victory to one or the other, and the sooner it can be ended the better for all the peoples of the area.

We express then on this significant anniversary gratitude and hope. We pray that United States-Israel friendship will deepen and grow in the interests of peace for all.

AMERICAN ISRAEL PUBLIC AFFAIRS COMMITTEE
STATEMENT OF POLICY, APRIL 24, 1966

The American Israel Public Affairs Committee is a national organization of American Jews established in 1954 which supports day-to-day action in Washington to strengthen U.S. policy in the Near East in order to guarantee stability, raise living standards, and promote an Arab-Israel peace settlement.

Israel this year celebrates her 18th birthday. In these 18 years, Israel has redeemed land and people, provided a home for refugees from persecution, restored an ancient spiritual and cultural homeland, translated the precepts of democracy into action to promote cooperation and freedom throughout the world.

But Israel is still a besieged land. She must remain on constant alert to defend herself from neighbors who refuse to make peace and who accumulate planes, tanks, ships, missiles and other lethal weapons in preparation for another attack.

I. THE NEED FOR PEACE NEGOTIATIONS

The continuing Arab threat to destroy Israel, reinforced by the arms escalation, menaces all the peoples of the Near East and challenges the great powers to take positive action looking toward peace.

We call upon our Government to exercise the full weight of American influence to bring the Arab States and Israel to the peace table.

II. THE ARMS RACE

The policies of the Egyptian Government gravely menace the peace of the area. In 1955, Egypt opened the Near East to Soviet penetration when President Nasser acquired large quantities of Soviet arms. Since then, there has been a constant flow of Russian military equipment, economic assistance and technical personnel to Egypt, Syria, Iraq, and Yemen. To fulfill his design to encircle Israel by an Egyptian-led and Egyptian-armed unified Arab command, Nasser has pressured other Arab States to increase their armaments, with funds contributed by the oil-producing states.

We are opposed to an arms race in the Near East or any other place, but we are also opposed to an arms imbalance which favors the nation bent on destroying its neighbor.

As long as Egypt continues these military

acquisitions, our Government has recognized the need to supply weapons to Israel in order to enable her to maintain her deterrent strength. Our Government has emphasized "the destabilizing effect of massive Soviet sales of arms to the area" and has assisted other nations whose regimes are threatened by President Nasser's Soviet-equipped forces.

The Arab States may be induced to make peace if they come to realize that Israel is fortified both by her own strength and by the commitment of the international community to preserve the peace.

There is no alternative to direct Arab-Israel peace negotiations. The call for peace must be raised constantly by the United States and all the great powers—firmly and without conditions.

III. U.S. AID

In recent years, American policy has clearly reflected our Government's determination to preserve the independence of the peoples of the Near East.

Its programs of economic assistance to Israel and the Arab States have fed, housed, trained, and employed people, and promoted better utilization of human and material resources.

Both the administration and Congress have adopted discriminating criteria in the allocation of economic aid, setting conditions to discourage recipients from misusing it—to the detriment of their economies and to the danger of their neighbors.

We welcome United States-Israel cooperation to develop a desalting program and we urge our Government to assist in the financing of such projects, which will open similar development in many lands.

IV. REFUGEES

We call for a realistic and constructive solution of the Arab refugee problem to serve the best interests of the refugees themselves. For almost two decades they have been kept as pawns in a propaganda and political war against Israel. They have been exploited by a demagogic leadership, which has refused all attempts to facilitate their resettlement and absorption and which now seeks to create an artificial nation in exile.

The Palestine Liberation Organization now seeks to enlist these refugees in an army and it is indefensible that funds of the United Nations Relief and Works Administration (UNRWA) should be squandered for rations which subsidize the mobilization and training of that army.

The rolls of UNRWA have been inflated and should be purged of those no longer eligible because of death, employment, and resettlement.

The Arab States responsible for the displacement of the Arab refugees must begin to assume responsibility for their rehabilitation and resettlement, and our aid program should be geared to serve those objectives.

V. THE BOYCOTT

We commend the Congress of the United States for its 1965 legislation to oppose the boycott which the Arab States have employed to harass American businessmen who deal with Israel and to involve Americans in the Arab war against Israel. We urge the administration to strengthen the regulations which implement that legislation.

We also commend the Congress of the United States for its strong opposition to the policies of the Arab States which discriminate against American Jews on the ground that they are Jews. We urge the administration to intensify its efforts to put an end to these intolerable practices.

We remind our Government that the Suez Canal is still closed, illegally, to Israel shipping.

VI. SUMMARY

We urge our Government:
To insist that the Arab governments negotiate a peace settlement with Israel which